

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/576,381	SHAH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Robert Havlin	1626	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Baerbel Brown. (3)_____.

(2) Robert Havlin. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 20 July 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-10 and 16-20.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner proposed that the product claims would be allowable if all of the claims were amended to within the scope of the elected group. Mrs. Brown inquired about what would be the status of the method claims and the examiner commented that he thought they might be rejoinable, but he would have to check with his supervisor. Upon further consideration of the method claims, the examiner only found support in the specification relating to a receptor binding assay of the exemplified compounds, therefore, absent some data more clearly connecting the compounds with the diseases claimed in claims 16-20, the method claims would have a 112 1st problem. Thus the claims allowable would be claims 1-10 amended to within the scope of group I of the requirement for restriction. Mrs. Brown asked for an office action to clarify the record.